

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 4, 7, and 9 [*sic*] stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,982,629 to *Shoji et al.* ("*Shoji*").

Claim 10 [*sic*] is restricted as being drawn to another method of manufacturing a battery pack.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants add independent claim 13, and submit new Fig. 3 to correct a typographical error in the drawings. Accordingly, claims 4, 7, 11, and 13 are presently pending.

Drawings

Applicants concurrently file herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawings with one (1) sheet of replacement drawings to substitute for the originally filed drawing sheets. Fig. 3 (on sheet 1 of 6) is amended to correct a typographical error. Support for the label error can be found at least at page 14, lines 6-16 of the Applicants' specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Fig. 3.

All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4, 7, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shoji*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness at least because *Shoji*, whether alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all the recited features of

independent claim 4. Independent claim 4 recites, in part, “a step of mounting an electronic component after the step of forming the insulating layer, the step of mounting the electronic component includes mounting the electronic component on given positions of the circuit board by a solder reflow process.” Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a reference providing an example of “the step of mounting the electronic component includes mounting the electronic component on given positions of the circuit board by a solder reflow process.” *Shoji* fails to teach or suggest at least these features of claim 4.

As pointed out in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. Because *Shoji*, fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 4, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 11 depend from independent claim 4. Accordingly, claims 7 and 11 are also allowable because of the additional features they recite and the reasons stated above. In view of the above, the present invention is patentable over the combination of *Shoji* and knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

New Claim 13

Applicants respectfully submit that *Shoji*, whether alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all the recited features of independent claim 13. Independent claim 13 recites, in part, “forming the base layer pattern on a surface of an insulating board; forming the first plated layer so as to cover the entire base layer by selective plating; and forming the second plated layer so as

to cover the entire first plated layer by selective plating; and forming the insulating layer on the second plated layer and patterning the insulating layer so that only a portion of the second plated layer is exposed externally.” Applicants respectfully submit that *Shoji* fails to teach or suggest at least these technical features of the present invention. Thus, the allowance of claim 13 should be granted.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

David E. Connor

Reg. No. 59,868

Dated: December 10, 2008

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202-739-7000

Facsimile: 202-739-3001